arXiv:1401.6439v1 [math.NT] 24 Jan 2014

INSULATORS OF ABC SOLUTIONS

JAMES E. WEIGANDT

Abstract. This note studies various ways of measuring the complexity of primitive solutions to the equation $A + B + C = 0$ and conjectures relating them. We define the insulator $\mathcal{I}(A, B, C)$ of a primitive solution as the smallest positive integer $\mathcal{I}$ such that the primes dividing the product $ABC \cdot \mathcal{I}$ are exactly those below a given bound. We show that the strong XYZ Conjecture of Lagarias and Soundararajan implies there are only finitely many primitive solutions (A, B, C) with a given insulator.

1. Introduction

This note concerns integer solutions to the ternary linear equation

$$A + B + C = 0. \tag{1}$$

We call such solutions **primitive** if $\gcd(A, B, C) = 1$ and **non-cuspidal** if the product ABC is non-zero. Let $\mathfrak{X}$ denote the set of all primitive and non-cuspidal integer solutions to (1).

We measure the complexity of these solutions, among other ways, by the **height** $H(A, B, C) = \max\{|A|, |B|, |C|\}$, and the **smoothness** $S(A, B, C)$ defined as the largest prime divisor of ABC.

The Lagarias–Soundararajan XYZ Conjecture [2] concerns the simultaneous behavior of $H(A, B, C)$ and $S(A, B, C)$. As the name suggests, the XYZ Conjecture is related to the celebrated ABC Conjecture, known to have far-reaching consequences. The main theorem of this note is a consequence of the XYZ Conjecture which seems surprising and does not appear to follow easily from the ABC Conjecture.

Say that a non-zero integer is **insulated** if it is divisible by exactly the primes less than a given bound and define the **insulator** $\mathcal{I}(A, B, C)$ as the smallest positive integer $\mathcal{I}$ such that $ABC \cdot \mathcal{I}$ is insulated.

Main Theorem. *If the strong form of the XYZ Conjecture is true, then there are only finitely many $(A, B, C) \in \mathfrak{X}$ with any fixed value of the insulator $\mathcal{I}(A, B, C)$.*

1.1. **Acknowledgements.** This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship under Grant No. DGE-1333468. The author thanks Edray Goins and Jeffery Lagarias for helpful conversations.

2. Semi-Heights on ABC Solutions

Define a **semi-height** on $\mathfrak{X}$ as a function $h : \mathfrak{X} \to \mathbb{R}$ for which the set $\mathfrak{X}_h(X) = \{(A, B, C) \in \mathfrak{X} \mid h(A, B, C) < X\}$ is finite for all real numbers $X > 0$. This section describes some semi-heights on $\mathfrak{X}$.

For non-zero integers n, define $\text{rad}(n)$ as the largest square-free divisor of n and $P^+(n)$ as the largest non-composite divisor of n.

Lemma 1. *Define the* **height** *by* $H(A, B, C) = \max\{|A|, |B|, |C|\}$, *the* **conductor** *by* $N(A, B, C) = \text{rad}(ABC)$, *and the* **smoothness** *by* $S(A, B, C) = P^+(ABC)$. *These are all semi-heights on* $\mathfrak{X}$.

Proof. The functions H, N, and S are related by the inequality

$$S(A, B, C) \leq \min\{H(A, B, C), N(A, B, C)\}. \tag{2}$$

It follows that $\mathfrak{X}_H(X) \cup \mathfrak{X}_N(X) \subseteq \mathfrak{X}_S(X)$ for all $X > 0$ and it suffices to show that $\mathfrak{X}_S(X)$ is finite for all $X > 0$.

Given $X > 0$, define $\Sigma = \Sigma(X)$ as the finite set consisting of all primes less than X. If $S(A, B, C) < X$ then the associated solution $(x, y) = (-A/C, -B/C)$ to the unit equation

$$x + y = 1 \tag{3}$$

must satisfy $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}_\Sigma^\times$. Since $\mathbb{Z}_\Sigma^\times$ is a finitely generated subgroup of $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}^\times$, it follows from [1, Theorem 5.2.1] that $(x, y) = (-A/C, -B/C)$ belongs to a finite set $U(X)$ which depends on X. Since two solutions $(A, B, C), (A', B', C') \in \mathfrak{X}$ satisfy $(-A/C, -B/C) = (-A'/C', -B'/C')$ if and only if $(A', B', C') = (uA, uB, uC)$ for some $u \in \mathbb{Z}^\times = \{\pm 1\}$, the finiteness of $\mathfrak{X}_S(X)$ follows from that of $U(X)$. □

There are far reaching conjectures relating the above semi-heights. For example, the celebrated ABC Conjecture of Masser and Oesterlé relates $H(A, B, C)$ and $N(A, B, C)$.

Conjecture 1 (ABC Conjecture, [3])**.** *For every* $\epsilon > 0$, *there are only finitely many* $(A, B, C) \in \mathfrak{X}$ *that satisfy* $H(A, B, C) > N(A, B, C)^{1+\epsilon}$.

The condition that $\epsilon > 0$ is necessary. To see this, note that for $k \geq 2$ we have $(A_k, B_k, C_k) = (2^k(2^k-2), 1, -(2^k-1)^2) \in \mathfrak{X}$ and

$$H(A_k, B_k, C_k) = (2^k-1)^2 > (2^k-1)(2^k-2) \geq N(A_k, B_k, C_k). \tag{4}$$

Recently, Lagarias and Soundararajan formulated a conjecture relating $H(A, B, C)$ and $S(A, B, C)$.

Conjecture 2 (XYZ Conjecture (strong form), [2])**.**

(a) *For every $\epsilon > 0$, only finitely many $(A, B, C) \in \mathfrak{X}$ satisfy*

$$\log H(A, B, C) > S(A, B, C)^{2/3+\epsilon}.$$

(b) *For every $\epsilon > 0$, infinitely many $(A, B, C) \in \mathfrak{X}$ satisfy*

$$\log H(A, B, C) > S(A, B, C)^{2/3-\epsilon}.$$

The XYZ and ABC conjectures are related by [2, Theorem 1.1] which asserts that the ABC conjecture implies a weaker version of Conjecture 2(a) where the exponent $2/3 + \epsilon$ is replaced by $1 + \epsilon$. We state here a weak version of Conjecture 2(a) which we don't know to follow from Conjecture 1 at the time of this writing.

Conjecture 3. *For every $\delta > 0$ there are only finitely many solutions $(A, B, C) \in \mathfrak{X}$ for which $\log H(A, B, C) > \delta\, S(A, B, C)$.*

Proposition 1. *Conjecture 2(a) implies Conjecture 3.*

Proof. Let $\delta > 0$ be given and let $X = \delta^{-6}$. Assume that Conjecture 3 is false. Assuming 2(a) we can then find infinitely many $(A, B, C) \in \mathfrak{X}$ such that

$$\delta S(A, B, C) < \log H(A, B, C) < S(A, B, C)^{5/6} \tag{5}$$

If follows that $S(A, B, C) < \delta^{-6} = X$ for infinitely many $(A, B, C) \in \mathfrak{X}$, a contradiction to Lemma 1. □

3. Insulators

We say a non-zero integer n is **insulated** if every prime $p \leq P^+(n)$ divides n. For example, the primorials $n\text{!`} = \mathrm{rad}(n!) = \prod_{p \leq n} p$ are insulated. Define the **insulator** of a non-zero integer n as the smallest positive integer $\mathcal{I}(n)$ such that $n \cdot \mathcal{I}(n)$ is insulated. For example, $\mathcal{I}(256256) = \mathcal{I}(2^8 \cdot 7 \cdot 11 \cdot 13) = 3 \cdot 5 = 15$. Since

$$P^+(n)\text{!`} = \mathrm{rad}(n)\, \mathcal{I}(n), \tag{6}$$

the insulator $\mathcal{I}(n)$ measures the failure of $\mathrm{rad}(n)$ to be a primorial.

Lemma 2. *Suppose that* $\{n_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ *is a sequence of non-zero integers such that* $\lim_{k\to\infty} P^+(n_k) = \infty$ *and* $\mathcal{I}(n_k)$ *is bounded. Let* α *and* β *be real numbers such that* $0 < \alpha < \log 2$ *and* $\beta > \log 4$*. The inequality*

$$\alpha P^+(n_k) < \log \operatorname{rad}(n_k) < \beta P^+(n_k) \tag{7}$$

holds for k *sufficiently large.*

Proof. Choose a real number $\epsilon > 0$ such that $0 < \alpha/(1-\epsilon) < \log 2$. By equation (6) we have

$$\log \operatorname{rad}(n_k) = \log P^+(n_k)\text{⁉} - \log \mathcal{I}(n_k). \tag{8}$$

Since $\mathcal{I}(n_k)$ is bounded, it follows that

$$(1-\epsilon)\log P^+(n_k)\text{⁉} < \log \operatorname{rad}(n_k) \leq \log P^+(n_k)\text{⁉} \tag{9}$$

for $P^+(n_k)$ sufficiently large. This inequality can be written as

$$(1-\epsilon)\theta(P^+(n_k)) < \log \operatorname{rad}(n_k) \leq \theta(P^+(n_k)) \tag{10}$$

in terms of the Chebyshev function $\theta(x) = \sum_{p\leq x} \log p = \log x\text{⁉}$. By applying [4, Corollary 2.10.1] we obtain

$$\frac{\alpha}{(1-\epsilon)} P^+(n_k) < \theta(P^+(n_k)) < \beta P^+(n_k) \tag{11}$$

when $P^+(n_k)$ is sufficiently large. Combining (10) and (11) with the hypothesis that $\lim_{n\to\infty} P^+(n_k) = \infty$, we obtain the validity of (7) for k sufficiently large. □

4. Insulators of ABC Solutions

We now use the language of insulators to study solutions in $\mathfrak{X}$. Define the **insulator** of a solution $(A, B, C) \in \mathfrak{X}$ by $\mathcal{I}(A, B, C) = \mathcal{I}(ABC)$.

Conjecture 4. *The function* $\mathcal{I} : \mathfrak{X} \to \mathbb{R}$ *defines a semi-height on* $\mathfrak{X}$*.*

Theorem 2. *Conjecture 3 implies Conjecture 4.*

Proof. We prove the contrapositive. Let $\{(A_k, B_k, C_k)\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ be an infinite sequence of distinct elements of

$$\mathfrak{X}_{\mathcal{I}}(X) = \{(A, B, C) \in \mathfrak{X} \mid \mathcal{I}(A, B, C) < X\} \tag{12}$$

for some real number X. Let $\{n_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ be given by $n_k = A_k B_k C_k$.

We show that $\{n_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 2. Indeed, $\mathcal{I}(n_k) = \mathcal{I}(A_k, B_k, C_k) < X$ for all k since $(A_k, B_k, C_k) \in \mathfrak{X}_{\mathcal{I}}(X)$. Also, $\lim_{k\to\infty} P^+(n_k) = \infty$ since $P^+(n_k) = S(A_k, B_k, C_k)$ and $S : \mathfrak{X} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a

semi-height on $\mathfrak{X}$ by Lemma 1. For any constant α with $0 < \alpha < \log 2$, Lemma 2 implies

$$\alpha P^+(n_k) < \log \operatorname{rad}(n_k) \tag{13}$$

for k sufficiently large.

To obtain a contradiction to Conjecture 3, we proceed by observing

$$\log H(A_k, B_k, C_k) \geq \tfrac{1}{3} \log \operatorname{rad}(A_k B_k C_k) = \tfrac{1}{3} \log \operatorname{rad}(n_k). \tag{14}$$

Combining inequalities (13) and (14) and letting $\delta = \alpha/3$ we have

$$\log H(A_k, B_k, C_k) > \delta\, P^+(n_k) \tag{15}$$

for k sufficiently large. Since $P^+(n_k) = S(A_k, B_k, C_k)$, this implies

$$\log H(A_k, B_k, C_k) > \delta\, S(A_k, B_k, C_k) \tag{16}$$

for all sufficiently large k. This contradicts Conjecture 3. □

We now prove the main theorem.

Proof of the Main Theorem. Assume the strong form of the XYZ Conjecture holds. Then Proposition 1 and Theorem 2 imply that $\mathcal{I} : \mathfrak{X} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a semi-height. It follows that all solutions $(A, B, C) \in \mathfrak{X}$ with a particular insulator $\mathcal{I}_0$ are contained in the finite set $\mathfrak{X}_{\mathcal{I}}(\mathcal{I}_0 + 1)$. □

References

[1] Enrico Bombieri and Walter Gubler. *Heights in Diophantine geometry*, volume 4 of *New Mathematical Monographs*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006.

[2] Jeffery C. Lagarias and Kannan Soundararajan. Smooth solutions to the *abc* equation: the *xyz* conjecture. *J. Théor. Nombres. Bordeaux*, 33(1):209–234, 2011.

[3] Joseph Oesterlé. Nouvelles approches du "théorème" de Fermat. *Astérisque*, (161-162): Exp. No. 694, 4, 165–186 (1989), 1988. Séminaire Bourbaki, Vol. 1987/88.

[4] Gérald Tenenbaum. *Introduction to analytic and probabilistic number theory*, volume 46 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995. Translated from the second French edition (1995) by C. B. Thomas.